



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,115	11/26/2003	John W. Barron	RSW920030264US1	1345
23550 7590 03/05/2009 HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC 75 STATE STREET 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207				
EXAMINER PATEL, CHIRAG R				
ART UNIT 2441		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/05/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,115

Applicant(s)

BARRON ET AL.

Examiner

CHIRAG R. PATEL

Art Unit

2441

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants arguments that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest in a user interface a list of files on the computer system along with a list of links to other computer systems to which the user has access, Examiner notes that Matsubara is directed to P2P (peer-to-peer) file sharing which permits users to share files with each other across multiple platforms . Matsubara per [0027] discloses file link which is a reference to another physical line and discloses "the physical files typically are distributed throughout the system"

In response to applicant's arguments that cited reference fails to teach or suggest the list of files having all files that the user is authorized to access irrespective of a location of the files within the computer system, the files being specific files that are independent of each other, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions, Matsubara discloses per [0063] access control list which can be provided to limit access to a file, and the permissions to access files are based on the ACL (access control list) and not the location of the files within the computer system.

In response to applicants arguments that the cited references fails to teach or suggest that the desired file is retrieved in isolation from an operating system of the computer system, user only needs to know how to navigate about the provider interfaces. Examiner points out that Matsubara discloses per Figure 6: item 602: user

selects a file link to initiate a request. This request is detected by the NRB (network resource browser) software, thus initiating a request to download the selected file to user_A's system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. - hereinafter Martin (US 2003/0217264) in view of Matsubara (US 2003/0225796).

As per claims 1, 10, 19, and 28, Martin discloses a computer-implemented method for providing real-time access to information on a computer system over a network, comprising:

receiving login data on the computer system from a user over the network;
retrieving access control permissions for the user based on the login data; ([0020])

receiving from the user a selection of a desired file from the list of files; and
([0020])

retrieving the desired file in real-time and communicating information in the desired file to the user. ([0020])

Martin fails to disclose presenting to the user in a user interface a list of files on the computer system along with a list of links to other computer systems to which the user has access, the list of files having all files that the user is authorized to access irrespective of a location of the files within the computer system, the files being specific files that are independent of each other on the computer system the user is authorized to access, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions, and wherein the desired file is retrieved in isolation from an operating system of the computer system.

Matsubara discloses presenting to the user in a user interface a list of files on the computer system along with a list of links to other computer systems to which the user has access, the list of files having all files that the user is authorized to access irrespective of a location of the files within the computer system, the files being specific files that are independent of each other on the computer system the user is authorized to access, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions, and wherein the desired file is retrieved in isolation from an operating system of the computer system. ([0007]; [0027], [0062]; On the other hand, if the user has access to the selected directory, then the server communicates some or all of the directory properties of the selected directory, in a step 514. The browser, in a step ;516, can then display the directory properties such as the children directories and the file

links, in an appropriate format., [0063]: In a step 602, a user (user_A) at a requesting client system selects a file link in the RNS server. This is detected by the NRB software, thus initiating a request to download the selected file to user_A's system.) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose presenting to the user in a user interface a list of files on the computer system the user is authorized to access, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing do would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

As per claims 2, 11, 20, and 29, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein the network is the Internet, and wherein the user interface is a web browser. ([0015])

As per claims 3, 12, 21, and 30, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein wherein the list of files contains at least one file type selected from the group consisting of a properties file, a configuration file and a log file. ([0004], security mechanisms, revision history and audit logs)

As per claims 4, 13, 22, and 31, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses further comprising receiving from the

user a selection of a particular location within the desired file, wherein the information communicated to the user is from the particular location. ([0006])

As per claims 5, 14, 23, and 32, Martin/ Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin fails to disclose further comprising the user searching the information using the user interface. Matsubara discloses further comprising the user searching the information using the user interface. ([0007],[0062]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose presenting to the user comprising the user searching the information using the user interface in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

As per claims 6, 15, 24, and 33, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein said contact information entity is an entry in a database accessible across a network. ([0015])

As per claims 7, 25, and 34, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein the files in the list of files are stored on the computer system. ([0015])

As per claims 8, 17, 26, and 35, Martin/ Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses the information in the file is communicated to the user interface for display. ([0015])

As per claims 9, 18, 27, and 36, Martin/ Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin fails to disclose wherein communicating the information in the desired file comprises downloading the desired file to the user for display of the information within the user interface. Matsubara discloses wherein communicating the information in the desired file comprises downloading the desired file to the user for display of the information within the user interface. ([0063]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein communicating the information in the desired file comprises downloading the desired file to the user for display of the information within the user interface in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

As per claim 16, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 10 receiving from the user a selection of a desired file from the list of files; and ([0020]) and accessing another one of the plurality of interconnected computer system based on the selection of the link, and wherein the desired file is retrieved in real-time from the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems. ([0004]); thereby enables multiple users to remotely access an electronic document in order to execute

an associated workflow while still addressing concerns regarding data security and validity)

Martin fails to disclose presenting to the user a new list of files the user is authorized to access on the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems, wherein the selecting step comprises selecting the desired file from the new list of files. Matsubara discloses presenting to the user a new list of files the user is authorized to access on the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems, wherein the selecting step comprises selecting the desired file from the new list of files. ([0062]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose presenting to the user a new list of files the user is authorized to access on the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems, wherein the selecting step comprises selecting the desired file from the new list of files in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharra, can be reached on (571)272-3880.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairedirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

/C. R. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2441
/Larry D Donaghue/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454